



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,732	12/15/2005	Felipe Martinez	63190A	3731
109	7590	08/29/2008	EXAMINER	
The Dow Chemical Company Intellectual Property Section P.O. Box 1967 Midland, MI 48641-1967			YAGER, JAMES C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/560,732	MARTINEZ, FELIPE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JAMES YAGER	1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15, 16 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-14 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-23 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 June 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20060705 & 20071001</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-14 and 17-22, drawn to a foamed polyolefin sheet.

Group II, claim(s) 15 and 16, drawn to a method of making a foamed sheet.

Group III, claim(s) 23, drawn to a bag, pouch, tape or film.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The special technical feature is “melt blown” which is recited in Group II but not recited in Groups I or III. Additionally, a bag, pouch, tape or film is recited in Group III but not recited in Groups I or II.

3. During a telephone conversation with Mr. James Hoppe on 12 August 2008 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-14 and 17-22. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 15, 16 and 23 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b).

Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues.

See MPEP § 804.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the blend" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-14 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kelch (US 5,000,992), as evidenced by Chen et al. (US 5,286,525) and Esneault et al. (WO 96/16122).

Regarding claims 1-14 and 17-22, Kelch discloses a multilayer film 3-10mils thick (C2/L45-50) comprising a foamed layer comprising 10-90% LLDPE and 10-90% LDPE (C3/L30-40) that comprises 60-90% of the film thickness (i.e. 1.8-9 mils thick) (C3/L45-55), wherein the LLDPE is LLDPE 4047 (C10/L20-30) having a density of 0.917 g/cc and a MI of 2.3 g/10 min (as evidenced by Chen et al. C4/L40-45) and the LDPE is LDPE 681 (C10/L20-30) having a density of 0.922 g/cc and a MI of 5.52 g/10 min (as evidenced by Esneault et al. P11/L15-20).

Given that the foamed layer of Kelch is made of the same materials in the same proportions and of the same thickness as the instantly claimed invention, it is clear that the foamed layer will possess identical properties i.e. having an MD tear strength of at least 150 gr/mil; the MD tear strength is greater than 350 gr/mil; the oxygen vapor transmission is 2.18 gr/mil/100 in.sq*24 hr; the layer has a density reduction of at least 20 percent compared to a non foamed layer of the same composition; having an MD tear strength of at least 50gr/mil.

Given that Kelch does not disclose that the foamed layer is crosslinked, it is the examiner's position that the polyolefin has substantially no crosslinking.

Although Kelch does not disclose that the foam layer has been made using a land length to die gap ratio of less than 25, or has been made using a blow up ratio of from about 2.2 to about 4.0 as claimed, it is noted that “[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the

product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process", *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) . Further, "although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product", *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir.1983). See MPEP 2113.

Therefore, absent evidence of criticality regarding the presently claimed the foamed layer has been made using a land length to die gap ratio of less than 25, or has been made using a blow up ratio of from about 2.2 to about 4.0 and given that Kelch meets the requirements of the claimed sheet, Kelch clearly meets the requirements of present claims 12, 13, 21 and 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
12. Claims 12 and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelch (US 5,000,992), as evidenced by Chen et al. (US 5,286,525) and Esneault et al. (WO 96/16122), as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, in further view of Hughes et al. (US 3,963,403).

Regarding claims 12 and 21, modified Kelch discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Kelch does not specifically disclose that the foam layer is made using a land length to die gap ratio of less than 25.

Hughes discloses a pipe made from foam plastic (C1/L13-15) that is made using a low land length to die gap ratio, optimally 2:1 (C2/L45-55). Hughes discloses that the low land length to die gap ratio prevents foaming upstream of the outlet and provides a stronger and leak resistant wall (C1/L48-51).

Kelch and Hughes are analogous art because they both teach about articles made of foamed plastic. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the land length to die gap ratio of 2 as disclosed by Hughes in the process of making the film of Kelch to provide a film that is stronger and leak resistant.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES YAGER whose telephone number is (571)270-3880. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs, 7:30am-5pm, EST, Alt. Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached on 571 272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JY 8/25/08

/Callie E. Shosho/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794

Application/Control Number: 10/560,732
Art Unit: 1794

Page 9